UDC:
323.2:004.89
323.23:172.1
10.62907/juuntics250202015l

Social and Ethical Challenges of Artificial Intelligence in International Political Communication

Boris Latinović[1], Olja Krčadinac[1]*

[1]University "Union – Nikola Tesla", Faculty of Informatics and Computer Science, Belgrade, Serbia
E-mail: blatinovic@unionnikolatesla.edu.rs, okrcadinac@unionnikolatesla.edu.rs

Check for updates

Abstract: Artificial intelligence has become deeply woven into the fabric of global political communication, subtly altering how states, institutions, and transnational actors attempt to shape public opinion across borders. Although AI-driven systems promise efficiency, predictive capacity, and unprecedented reach, they simultaneously generate vulnerabilities that are neither easily measurable nor ethically neutral. This article investigates the social and ethical complexities emerging from the deployment of AI in the international political sphere. Central attention is given to disinformation dynamics, algorithm-mediated asymmetries of power, the erosion of individual autonomy, and the global diffusion of biased technological infrastructures. The study draws upon political sociology, communication ethics, and the sociology of technology to establish a multidimensional framework that captures the intertwined nature of AI's political, cultural, and moral consequences. It argues that without sustained ethical vigilance and cross-border regulatory cooperation, AI will continue to amplify the existing inequalities in the global political landscape and undermine the conditions necessary for democratic deliberation.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, Political Communication, Disinformation, Algorithmic Power, Ethical Governance.*

Introduction

Artificial intelligence has entered international political communication not with the loud steps of a conqueror, but rather with the quiet persistence of a system that operates beneath perception. What once depended on the persuasive voice of diplomats, the ideological tone of state media, or the slow rhythm of traditional political campaigns now increasingly travels through opaque algorithmic infrastructures that decide (long before citizens even notice) what will reach their screens, how it will be framed, and which emotional contours it should evoke.

The transformation is not merely technical. It reshapes the grammar of political interaction. Political messaging across borders used to be a matter of strategic calculation, ideological projection, and human judgment. Today it unfolds in an environment where data analytics, generative models, predictive systems, and automated narratives operate with a logic of their own. These new instruments do not simply transmit political speech: they recombine it, anticipate preferred reactions, and tailor it to the psychological dispositions of millions.

For regions like Eastern Europe, which historically oscillate between large global forces and whose public spheres have always been exposed to foreign influences, AI-driven communication brings an additional layer of vulnerability. It introduces a subtle kind of power, a blend of persuasion and technological dependency, that can shape political imaginaries without announcing itself. To Western audiences, the phenomenon often appears abstract; yet in transitional societies, its effects are felt directly, as if a new invisible actor has stepped into the public square.

In this article, I examine the social and ethical dimensions of these changes. The goal is not to demonize AI nor to present it as an uncontestably destiny, but to uncover the invisible mechanisms through which it reorganizes international political communication. I propose that the ethical question,

*Corresponding author: blatinovic@unionnikolatesla.edu.rs

© 2025 by the authors. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

who is responsible for algorithmic political influence, and toward whom, is becoming one of the defining issues of contemporary political life.

AI as a Socio-Technical Infrastructure

Contemporary AI functions as a hybrid system composed of technical architectures, organizational interests, cultural expectations, and global flows of data. Scholars increasingly describe AI as a form of infrastructural power, capable of influencing public perception through its structural position in the communication ecosystem. This infrastructural power means that AI systems are not neutral intermediaries; they carry embedded assumptions, incentives, and constraints derived from their design and economic environment.

Traditional political communication relied on identifiable sources and predictable channels. AI disrupts this pattern by enabling:

- micro-personalized political narratives
- predictive modelling of public sentiment
- automated cross-border messaging campaigns
- fragmentation of audiences into isolated informational "textual bubbles"

These transformations complicate the distinction between propaganda, persuasion, and legitimate political communication.

Ethical analysis relies on several philosophical traditions:

- deontological ethics, which demands transparency and respect for autonomy
- consequentialism, which evaluates political outcomes of algorithmic influence
- virtue ethics, which considers what political character emerges when persuasion becomes automated
- relational ethics, which emphasizes the moral quality of interactions between humans and AI systems

When applied to international political communication, these frameworks reveal the complexity of assigning responsibility within distributed algorithmic environments.

Global Landscape of AI-Driven Political Communication

The United States promotes an innovation-driven, market-cantered approach to AI governance. China integrates AI into a centralized political vision that merges technological advancement with state-led ideological messaging. The European Union emphasizes a rights-based regulatory model prioritizing human dignity and democratic accountability. These differing paradigms produce a fragmented global environment in which smaller states lack the capacity to negotiate with powerful AI infrastructures that transcend borders.

States with limited technological capacity often become dependent on foreign platforms for their political communication environment. This informational dependency reduces their ability to control digital sovereignty, exposing them to algorithmic biases generated outside their cultural context.

Private digital platforms now possess the ability to amplify or suppress political narratives globally. Their influence extends beyond national jurisdictions, making them de facto geopolitical actors. [1] Their algorithmic systems shape visibility, frame international conflicts, and influence elections in subtle yet far-reaching ways.

Social Challenges

Algorithmic systems are built to maximize engagement rather than foster meaningful democratic deliberation. They prioritize emotionally charged content, thereby deepening ideological divides and enabling foreign actors to strategically exploit latent social tensions. This intensified polarization heightens overall vulnerability to manipulative political messaging. In practice, such systems generate psychological

echo chambers in which individuals encounter predominantly those messages that reinforce their existing worldviews, turning difference of opinion into a form of symbolic threat. Over time, digital spaces that were once envisioned as platforms for pluralistic dialogue become arenas of antagonistic contestation, where emotionally provocative messages are algorithmically rewarded regardless of their factual integrity. This cycle of fragmentation reshapes how communities imagine one another, as opposing groups begin to perceive disagreement not as a democratic necessity, but as a destabilizing force. The engagement-driven logic of digital platforms simultaneously creates openings for external influence, allowing foreign actors to identify and amplify social fault lines with minimal resistance. As these pressures accumulate, societies enter a state of "permanent vigilance," unsure whether political discourse is organic or strategically engineered. This erosion of confidence in the informational environment contributes to a broader crisis of trust in public institutions, civic processes, and interpersonal communication. Consequently, democratic deliberation weakens, and the conditions that sustain political extremism become progressively normalized, as the algorithmic ecosystem elevates intensity over substance.

AI-enhanced disinformation campaigns now rely on synthetic media, automated account networks, and predictive modelling to shape the attitudes of foreign publics. Their cross-border diffusion complicates attribution and accountability, leaving governments with limited institutional tools to respond effectively. These campaigns function through fluid, decentralized architectures that are difficult to trace, blurring the boundaries between state-driven operations, proxy actors, and opportunistic digital groups. Synthetic audio-visual materials, including deepfakes, introduce a new layer of epistemic instability by undermining citizens' confidence in sensory evidence itself. As a result, trust in journalism, official communications, and even interpersonal messaging is systematically weakened. Algorithmically targeted disinformation adapts rapidly to the emotional patterns of specific populations, exploiting triggers such as fear, resentment, or moral outrage in ways tailored to local socio-historical contexts. Predictive models operate like psychological cartographies, identifying points of maximal susceptibility where persuasive pressure will have the greatest impact. Traditional state institutions often respond too slowly, constrained by legal frameworks and bureaucratic procedures that cannot match the velocity of algorithmic amplification. In the meantime, public discourse becomes increasingly opaque and volatile, reducing the distinction between domestic and foreign influence to a matter of mere technical sophistication. Under these conditions, global political communication evolves into a competitive battleground where truth is determined less by evidentiary standards and more by algorithmic visibility and narrative momentum.

Micro-targeting driven by large-scale personal data collection has the capacity to steer political preferences beneath the threshold of conscious awareness. Political messages crafted to exploit psychological vulnerabilities undermine collective debate and weaken democratic autonomy. In this paradigm, citizens are recast as clusters of behavioural indicators and emotional profiles, while political persuasion becomes a form of neuro-psychological targeting. When messages are tailored so precisely that they resonate with individual fears, aspirations, or frustrations, the shared public sphere dissolves into a constellation of private political realities. Voters then participate in elections and public discussions on the basis of pre-engineered predispositions rather than reflective judgment. This fragmentation of the informational landscape erodes the sense of a common political horizon, as different segments of society inhabit incommensurable informational worlds. Individuals are typically unaware that their perceptions are being shaped, which reinforces the illusion of autonomous political agency while masking the underlying architecture of influence. These dynamics raise profound questions about the authenticity of political will: can a decision be considered free if it is constructed through algorithmic profiling? Moreover, the private corporations that design and deploy these targeting systems operate without democratic accountability, further complicating the ethical landscape. Over time, micro-targeting contributes to the dissolution of a shared democratic imagination, posing a serious threat to the very foundations of deliberative political life.

Cultural Vulnerabilities in Transitional Societies

In societies marked by historical trauma or geopolitical instability (particularly those in Eastern Europe) algorithmic interventions tend to resonate with exceptional depth. Narrative manipulation becomes

more feasible when public trust is structurally fragile, dispersed, or historically undermined. Over time, algorithmically curated narratives can become internalized, subtly shaping citizens' political perceptions without overt coercion. This gradual "colonization of the mind" challenges traditional conceptions of political identity and agency. Transitional societies, still negotiating the legacies of conflict, state dissolution, and shifting geopolitical alignments, provide fertile ground for such processes. Collective memory in these contexts often remains contested and emotionally charged, allowing algorithmic systems to reactivate dormant grievances or anxieties embedded in historical consciousness. Because the boundary between past and present is frequently blurred, artificially crafted narratives can easily masquerade as extensions of familiar cultural scripts, even when they originate from external strategic actors. As a result, the digital environment becomes a terrain of symbolic struggle in which identities are continually reconstructed under conditions shaped by technological platforms rather than local deliberative practices. Geopolitical pressures further heighten this susceptibility: any new international crisis can serve as a trigger for algorithmically amplified campaigns targeting fear, perceived victimhood, or existential insecurity. Over time, citizens may lose the ability to distinguish between organic public narratives and strategically manufactured ones, generating confusion about the authenticity of their own political intuitions. In this setting, political agency is reconfigured; instead of emerging from reflective civic engagement, it is increasingly shaped by the flow of algorithmically curated informational stimuli. Ultimately, these dynamics raise critical questions about whether transitional societies can stabilize their democratic institutions if their epistemic foundations remain constantly exposed to algorithmic manipulation.

Ethical Challenges

AI often functions as a "black box", making it difficult to understand how political messages are selected, modified, or amplified. This opacity disperses responsibility among platform owners, developers, and political actors. Biases embedded in training data or design choices can distort international representations of certain regions or groups. When these biases influence political communication, global inequalities are further reinforced.

AI-driven political persuasion threatens individual autonomy by exploiting psychological patterns to influence opinions. As the boundary between authentic judgment and algorithmic suggestion weakens, democratic agency becomes fragile. Foreign actors can influence public opinion in other states without crossing physical borders, challenging traditional notions of sovereignty. This raises concerns about interference in elections, referendums, and diplomatic discourse.

Because AI systems optimize for efficiency, they may push political discourse toward standardized forms devoid of cultural nuance. This homogenization limits the diversity of political expression globally.

Case Studies

The Cambridge Analytica scandal revealed how personal data could be exploited to influence political outcomes through micro-targeted messaging. It served as the first global warning about the dangers of algorithmic political persuasion. The episode also exposed how opaque data brokerage systems feed into political profiling without the awareness or consent of citizens. It demonstrated that AI-driven persuasion can become indistinguishable from manipulation when deployed without proper ethical oversight. Moreover, the scandal highlighted the vulnerability of democratic processes when computational power intersects with psychological modelling. Its legacy continues to shape regulatory conversations worldwide, serving as a benchmark for understanding the risks of unrestrained digital political influence.

Russia - Ukraine Information Warfare

The Russia - Ukraine conflict demonstrated how AI-assisted propaganda, narrative generation, and automated sentiment manipulation became tools of geopolitical struggle. Algorithmic amplification played a crucial role in shaping global perceptions of legitimacy and aggression. Beyond traditional state-

controlled media, computational propaganda networks used deepfake videos, synthetic audio, and bot-driven discourse to distort the informational environment. These digital artifacts often circulated faster than fact-checking mechanisms could respond, producing alternative versions of events that competed with verified reality. AI-enhanced linguistic models further enabled rapid translation and localization of propaganda, making messages more resonant across diverse linguistic communities. In this environment, information became both a weapon and a shield, with each side striving to define truth as a strategic resource. The conflict ultimately revealed how AI collapses the distance between technical systems and geopolitical intentions, allowing states to contest narratives in real time on a global scale.

U.S. - China Digital Diplomacy

AI is now integral to the strategic communication efforts of the United States and China. Their approaches reflect broader ideological and geopolitical models embedded in technological infrastructures. The United States tends to emphasize decentralized innovation ecosystems, where private sector platforms indirectly shape global political narratives. China, conversely, integrates AI within a state-centric framework, using centralized digital governance to coordinate external messaging with internal stability goals. The competition between these two models increasingly plays out on social media platforms, multilateral institutions, and transnational digital corridors. Their rivalry has also generated distinct norms regarding transparency, algorithmic accountability, and data sovereignty. As both nations project geopolitical influence through AI-augmented messaging, smaller states often find themselves navigating overlapping spheres of digital power. Thus, AI becomes more than a communicative tool - it serves as a symbolic battleground through which contrasting political values attempt to assert global relevance.

Balkan Informational Dynamics

The Balkans, as a historically contested region, illustrate how algorithmic political communication interacts with unresolved national narratives. Foreign-generated political content easily finds resonance, shaping international alignments and public sentiment. Because collective memory remains fragmented along ethnic and political lines, AI-driven messaging can quickly amplify existing tensions. Automated recommendation systems often push emotionally charged content to the forefront, intensifying divisions rather than fostering deliberation. External actors exploit these vulnerabilities by crafting narratives that appeal to local grievances, identity politics, or geopolitical loyalties. Domestic political groups sometimes mirror these tactics, using AI-mediated communication to mobilize supporters or discredit opponents. As a result, the digital sphere becomes a continuation of regional political history - one where algorithms, rather than traditional institutions, arbitrate which stories gain authority and which are submerged.

Toward a Framework for Ethical Governance in the Age of AI and Emerging Transhumanism

A viable regulatory framework must include commitments to transparency, source identification, limits on micro-targeting, and mechanisms ensuring user autonomy. Such a framework must also anticipate the rapid evolution of AI-generated political communication, which increasingly blurs the line between authentic political discourse and algorithmically curated persuasion. Effective governance will therefore require clear standards defining what constitutes legitimate political messaging, especially in environments where automated content production can outpace human monitoring capacities. In addition, institutional safeguards must be designed to ensure that citizens maintain meaningful control over their informational environments, rather than becoming passive receptors of opaque algorithmic decisions. This implies the need for multi-layered oversight mechanisms capable of auditing both the data pipelines that fuel micro-targeting and the inferential models that operationalize them. Transparency obligations must extend not only to states and political parties but also to private technology companies whose algorithmic infrastructures shape the global flow of political meaning. Regulatory bodies will need the authority to impose restrictions on persuasive technologies that manipulate emotional vulnerabilities or

exploit cognitive biases, particularly when such practices occur covertly. A durable governance framework must also integrate ethical evaluation procedures, ensuring that new technologies are assessed in terms of their broader socio-political consequences rather than solely through economic or technical metrics. Ultimately, the goal is to create institutional conditions under which democratic agency remains grounded in informed deliberation rather than algorithmic suggestion, preserving the integrity of the civic sphere in an era of accelerating informational complexity.

AI in political communication transcends borders, requiring coordinated international governance supported by institutions such as UNESCO, the UN, and OSCE. Global cooperation is indispensable because AI-generated political influence travels instantaneously across jurisdictions, bypassing traditional diplomatic channels and rendering national regulatory systems insufficient on their own. International institutions must therefore articulate shared normative principles. For example, prohibitions on AI-enabled electoral interference, standards for digital evidence verification, and protocols for responding to coordinated disinformation campaigns. These bodies should also facilitate cross-border data sharing, enabling states to identify and counter transnational networks that deploy AI-driven persuasion tools. Furthermore, coordinated governance must address global inequalities in technological capacity: smaller or less developed states are disproportionately vulnerable to algorithmic manipulation and require institutional support to ensure digital sovereignty. International law will need to evolve toward a hybrid model that combines human rights protections with emerging norms related to algorithmic transparency, synthetic media disclosure, and cross-border accountability. Without such coordination, the informational environment risks devolving into a geopolitical battlefield dominated by technologically advanced actors capable of shaping political realities beyond their own borders. Cooperative frameworks anchored in global institutions can mitigate these asymmetries, ensuring that technological development does not erode democratic autonomy but instead strengthens collective resilience. Ultimately, responsible international governance will require not merely treaties but the cultivation of shared ethical commitments capable of sustaining political pluralism in a digitally integrated world.

Transhumanism spectacularly opened a new dimension of humanity and firmly took its place in many branches of science today. Within political communication, transhumanist thinking reframes the relationship between human cognition and technological augmentation, raising difficult questions about the future of political agency. As AI systems increasingly mediate perception, memory, and decision-making, the boundary between human reasoning and machine assistance becomes progressively porous. This creates a conceptual shift: citizens are no longer merely influenced by technology but are gradually integrated into techno-cultural ecosystems that extend their cognitive capacities while simultaneously shaping them. Transhumanism thus compels governance frameworks to address a deeper ethical concern, the possibility that political persuasion will eventually target enhanced cognitive architectures rather than natural psychological dispositions. In such a scenario, the stakes of political autonomy are transformed, as external actors might influence not just beliefs but the augmented cognitive processes through which beliefs are formed. Moreover, transhumanist developments challenge traditional democratic assumptions about equality, since access to cognitive or informational enhancement technologies may become unevenly distributed. Governance will need to ensure that these augmentations do not produce new hierarchies of political influence or deepen existing social divides. Transhumanism also invites reconsideration of the concept of the public sphere itself: if political communication occurs within a hybrid human-machine epistemic system, then safeguarding deliberation requires protections that encompass both biological and augmented forms of reasoning. Ultimately, integrating transhumanist perspectives into political communication governance ensures that regulatory frameworks remain forward-looking, attentive not only to current AI capabilities but also to the emerging forms of technologically extended human agency.

In a world saturated with automated narratives, ethical governance must restore the centrality of human reasoning and responsibility. This requires cultivating digital literacy programs that empower citizens to interrogate algorithmic outputs, recognize synthetic content, and critically assess persuasive techniques. Ethical governance must also promote a culture of accountability, ensuring that both public and private actors are held responsible for deploying AI in ways that distort democratic processes. As

algorithmic mediation becomes ubiquitous, fostering human-centered decision-making will depend on supporting institutional environments that encourage transparency, dialogical engagement, and pluralistic debate. Restoring human responsibility also means resisting tendencies to treat algorithmic systems as neutral or inevitable; instead, these technologies must be seen as socio-technical constructs shaped by human choices, values, and priorities. In addition, ethical governance should encourage reflexive practices within technological design communities, ensuring that engineers and data scientists understand the political implications of their work. A human-centered approach must likewise reaffirm the dignity of political participation, recognizing that meaningful civic engagement cannot be outsourced to automated systems. As political communication becomes increasingly hybridized through AI and transhumanist augmentation, governance must protect the spaces in which citizens can deliberate free from coercive digital pressures. Ultimately, ethical governance in this evolving landscape demands a renewed commitment to cultivating political judgment, reinforcing democratic resilience, and safeguarding the moral autonomy of individuals navigating a technologically augmented world.

Conclusion

Artificial intelligence has transformed international political communication in profound ways, blurring the boundaries between persuasion, manipulation, and geopolitical influence. The ethical stakes are immense: AI can enhance cross-cultural dialogue, yet it can also fracture public spheres, distort democratic processes, and weaken sovereignty. The political world emerging from these shifts demands greater vigilance, deeper ethical reflection, and institutional courage capable of confronting the hidden infrastructures that shape global opinion.

Yet beyond the technical and regulatory debates lies a deeper human concern. Societies must decide whether they will become passive landscapes shaped by algorithmic currents or active agents who assert their moral and political agency. The challenge is not only to understand AI but to cultivate the inner resilience needed to withstand the seductive ease of automated certainty.

If the 20th century belonged to mass ideologies and visible propaganda, the 21st belongs to silent influence - woven into interfaces, predictive models, and the curated architecture of the digital world. For international politics to retain legitimacy, citizens must reclaim the capacity for doubt, reflection, and responsible judgment. Without this, no regulatory framework will be sufficient.

The future of political communication will be determined not solely by algorithms, but by the moral posture with which humanity confronts them. It is here, at the intersection of technological power and human consciousness, that the struggle for democratic authenticity will be decided.

References

Atar, N. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and the Transformation in Political Communication and Campaigns: Ethical Debates, Analyses, and Cases. In Understanding Generative AI in a Cultural Context: Artificial Myths and Human Realities (pp. 461-490). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.

Benjamins R., Salazar I. (2020). Towards a framework for understanding societal and ethical implications of Artificial Intelligence.

Checketts, L., Boyles, R. J., Chan, B. S. B., Gan, Z. R., Hongladarom, S., Kimura, T., ... & Gonzalez-Ferrer Garcia, A. (2025). Ethical and Social Concerns of Artificial Intelligence in Asia. NanoEthics, 19(2), 12.

Chen, Y. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and Digital Imaging: Future Trends in Editing and Ethical Concerns. Journal of Sociology and Education, 1(2).

Christodoulou E., Iordanou K. (2021). Democracy Under Attack: Challenges of Addressing Ethical Issues of AI and Big Data for More Democratic Digital Media and Societies.

Corrêa N.K., Galvão C., Santos J.W., et al. (2022). Worldwide AI Ethics: a review of 200 guidelines and recommendations for AI governance.

Dlamini, Z. (2025). GLOBAL AI ETHICS: A REVIEW OF THE SOCIAL IMPACTS AND ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE.

Floridi, L. (2023). The ethics of artificial intelligence: Principles, challenges, and opportunities.

Graglia, M. A. V., Huelsen, P., & Lazzareschi, N. (2021). The growing moral challenge in the face of technologies: internet, social networks, IoT, blockchain and artificial intelligence. Journal on Innovation and Sustainability RISUS, 12(2), 17-29.

Gutiérrez Caneda B., Lindén C G., Vázquez Herrero J. (2024). Ethics and journalistic challenges in the age of artificial

intelligence: talking with professionals and experts.
Hagelstein, J., Volk, S. C., Zerfass, A., Silveira Athaydes, A., Macnamara, J., Meng, J., & Hung-Baesecke, C. J. F. (2024). Ethical challenges of digital communication: a comparative study of public relations practitioners in 52 countries. International Journal of Communication, 18, 1072-1093.
Hagerty A., Rubinov I. (2019). Global AI Ethics: A Review of the Social Impacts and Ethical Implications of Artificial Intelligence.
Ivanović M., Raković R. (2024). Challenges for the Application of Artificial Intelligence and Ethical Issues.
Jafarova L.A. (2024). Political Institutions in Times of AI, and Ethical Aspects of the Digitalization in Politics.
Jovanović S., Dražeta L., Petrović A., Bačanin Džakula N., Živković M. (2025). Ethical Concerns and Mass Agentic AI Adoption.
Jungherr, A. (2023). Artificial intelligence and democracy: A conceptual framework. Social media+ society, 9(3), 20563051231186353.
Kóňa, M. A. (2025). ETHICAL CHALLENGES IN THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE FOR MARKETING COMMUNICATION IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR21. PUBLICY 2024 I., 108.
Latinović, B. B., Ostojić, B. M., & Bugarčić, M. D. (2023). Analysis Of Attitudes Towards Social-Economic And Marketing Factors On The Growth Of Organic Production. Економика пољопривреде, 70(3), 725-735.
Latinović, B., & Ostojić, B. (2023). Socio-political context and strategy of modern marketing. Politička revija, 75(1), 281-298.
Latinović, B., Ostojić, B., Krčadinac, O., & Stanković, Ž. (2023). Socio-Marketing Aspects of the Application of Artificial Intelligence in Environmental Protection and Preservation. In Proceedings of The Third International Conference on Sustainable Environment and Technologies [„Creating sustainable commUNiTy “] (pp. 185-200).
Sahebi S., Formosa P. (2025). The AI mediated communication dilemma: epistemic trust, social media, and the challenge of generative artificial intelligence.
Schopmans H., Cupać J. (2021). Engines of Patriarchy: Ethical Artificial Intelligence in Times of Illiberal Backlash Politics.
Škorić J., Galetin M. (2024). Artificial Intelligence and Social Work: Ethical Dilemmas and Challenges in the Protection of Human Rights.
Spalević Ž., Marković F., Marković S. (2023). Artificial Intelligence: The New Inevitability of Contemporary Society.
Taddeo M., Floridi L. (2018). How AI can be a force for good. Science.
Volodenkov, S. V., Fedorchenko, S. N., & Pechenkin, N. M. (2024). Risks, threats, and challenges of introducing artificial intelligence and neural network algorithms into the contemporary system of socio-political communications: The results of expert study. RUDN Journal of Political Science, 26(2), 406-424.